



PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: P3776
Client/Matter No.: 80168.0060
Express Mail No. EV322526410US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
Paul W. Weschler, Jr.) Group Art Unit: 2177
Serial No. 09/315,200) Examiner: K. PHAM
Filed: May 19, 1999) Confirmation No.: 6203
For: MECHANISM AND METHOD FOR)
MANAGING SERVICE-SPECIFIED DATA IN)
A PROFILE SERVICE)

RECEIVED

JUN 10 2003

Technology Center 2100

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The undersigned hereby certifies that the following documents:

1. Transmittal of Appellant's Reply Brief Under 37 CFR 1.193 (1 page)
2. Appellant's Reply Brief Under 37 CFR 1.193 (3 pages);
3. Certificate of Mailing by Express Mail; and
4. Return Receipt Postcard

relating to the above application, were deposited as "Express Mail", Mailing Label No. Express Mail No. EV322526410US with the United States Postal Service, addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on June 6, 2003.

6/6/03
Date

6/6/03
Date

Stuart T. Langley
Mailer

Stuart T. Langley
Stuart T. Langley, #33,940
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
Phone: (720) 406-5335
Fax: (720) 406-5301



COPY

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: P3776
Client/Matter No.: 80168.0060
Express Mail No. EV322526410US

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of:

Paul W. Weschler, Jr.

Serial No.: 09/315,200

Filed: May 19, 1999

For: **MECHANISM AND METHOD FOR
MANAGING SERVICE-SPECIFIED
DATA IN A PROFILE SERVICE**

Art Unit: 2177

Examiner: K. PHAM

Confirmation No.: 6203

RECEIVED

JUN 10 2003

Technology Center 2100

TRANSMITTAL OF APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR 1.193

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Please find enclosed an original and three copies of Appellant's Reply Brief Under 37 CFR 1.193 in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed May 6, 2003. No fee is believed due, however, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2003

BY: Stuart T. Langley

Stuart T. Langley, #33,940
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
Phone: (720) 406-5335
Fax: (720) 406-5301



#25
6/11/03
A.W.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:

Paul W. Weschler, Jr.

Serial No.: 09/315,200

Filed: May 19, 1999

For: **MECHANISM AND METHOD FOR
MANAGING SERVICE-SPECIFIED
DATA IN A PROFILE SERVICE**

Art Unit: 2177

Examiner: K. PHAM

Confirmation No.: 6203

RECEIVED

JUN 10 2003

Technology Center 2100

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR 1.193

The Examiner's Answer mailed May 6, 2003 presents, in large part, an accurate characterization of the present invention. In particular, the comparison and contrast of Fig. 5 of the invention with Table 4 of the Thomas reference is a useful tool for pointing out what is claimed.

However, the Examiner's Answer characterizes specific attributes in the Thomas table 4 (specifically, "Object Type Name", "Object Type Version", "Last Update Time"...etc.) as metadata that are used to manage a true-data attribute. This characterization points out clearly a difference between what is being claimed and what is shown in Thomas. Each of these attributes specify some property of an external object¹, not properties that are used to manage the true data attribute itself.

¹ In object-oriented programming (OOP), objects are the things you think about first in designing a program and they are also the units of code that are eventually derived from the process. Each object is an instance of a particular class or subclass with the class's own methods or procedures and data variables. An object is what actually runs in the computer.

The “Object Type Version” in Thomas refers to a version number associated with the external object, not a version number of the “Object Type #1 attribute”. Suppose, for example, that each time one of the attributes under the “Object Type #1” were changed, a version number for that set of attributes were created/updated in the form of an attribute within the Information repository. In other words, if the “Operating System” attribute were changed from “XP” to “Unix”, the value of the version attribute would change from 1.0 to 1.1—irrespective of the version of XP or UNIX that was being used. In that case, a meta-data attribute indicating the version information could be used to manage the true-data attribute. However, Thomas does not contemplate any such arrangement. Instead, the version number in Thomas reflects the version of the external object (e.g., the version of XP or UNIX), and will be updated when the external object changes, not when the true-data attribute changes.

Similarly, the “Last Update Time” attribute in Thomas indicates when the external object is updated, not when the “information repository” is updated. Hence, the “Last Update Time” can be used to manage the external object, but is not useful in managing any part of the information repository itself. In contrast, the “type=upd_98409245” attribute in Fig. 5 of applicant’s specification refers to when the “type=user” metadata was changed (e.g., when any of the “type=mod_764”, “type=own_princpl1”... attributes were changed, added, deleted). By way of contrast, the “type=upd_98409245” attribute of Fig. 5 does not indicate an update to any external object or entity such as “user-smith”.

In other words, the metadata attributes and true data attributes called for in the claims 1-53 enable the profile data structure to be “self-describing” with respect to management of the true-data attributes. In contrast, Thomas describes a system in which the attributes contained in an information repository describe external entities, not entities within the data structure itself.

In view of all of the above, claims 1-53 are believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection be overturned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2003

By: Stuart T. Langley

Stuart T. Langley, #33,940
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
Phone: (720) 406-5335
Fax: (720) 406-5301